



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The essay collects valuable material, should stimulate to further study, and is a needed reminder of important considerations often overlooked. It illustrates that welcome contributions to textual criticism may be expected from many quarters; but also that no single line of observation, however brilliantly conceived and patiently carried out, will lead to a general solution of a problem which has been complicated by the intricate working of many forces.

JAMES H. ROPES.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

DER BRIEF DES PAULUS AN DIE RÖMER. Ausgelegt von D. Dr. ERNST KÜHL, Professor der Theologie in Göttingen. Quelle & Meyer, Leipzig. 1913. Pp. xvi, 511.

Professor Kühl, with a sincere and affectionate piety, honorable alike to himself and to his venerable instructor, dedicates his commentary to his "highly esteemed and fatherly friend," Professor D. Dr. Bernhard Weiss. There is special propriety in this, for the commentary in the main follows the lines of thought which Professor Weiss has made familiar to his numerous readers.

The book contains no formal introduction, but questions usually treated in introductions are incidentally discussed in the interpretation of passages which suggest them, and the volume ends with a "conclusion" which presents the author's views upon some of them. This may seem to many a regrettable omission, for a reader can estimate more justly and sometimes understand more perfectly an interpreter's comments if he is first told his opinions upon questions of the authorship, date, etc., of the document which he is discussing.

Dr. Kühl accepts the claim which the Epistle makes to Pauline authorship without question or argument. He seems to think that it has been transcribed and preserved without serious redaction or interpolation. *Ἐν Ῥώμῃ*, in 1 7, 15, was, he holds, in the original document. The fifteenth and sixteenth chapters were in the Epistle as it came from the hand of Paul, except the section 1 1-20, 24, which was incorporated from a letter of Paul's to the Ephesians; and the doxology was written by Paul, perhaps with his own hand, at the end of the Epistle.

Questions of textual criticism are not often or very fully discussed; though when the form of the text is of special significance for the exegesis, the author gives his opinion and briefly his reasons for it. He holds, for example, that the context demands the reading *ἐχομεν* in 5 1, notwithstanding the support given *ἐχωμεν* in important manuscripts.

The instruction which the apostle gives in the thirteenth chapter concerning the attitude Christians should take towards the Roman civil government, proves that the Epistle must have been written before the breaking out of the Neronian persecution; but the date of its composition is not more closely indicated.

Professor Kühn confidently maintains and repeatedly affirms, as against Zahn and others, that Gentile converts formed a majority in the Church at Rome, though it also included in its membership a Jewish-Christian minority. It is difficult to see why this question should seem so important, or should be capable of such positive decision as Kühn and many others, on each side of the question, contend. If each element was present and enlisted the interest of the apostle, what does it signify whether the Gentile or Jewish converts were more numerous? And if Paul more frequently or with more apparent interest or solicitude addresses his words to the Gentile element, may there not be other reasons for this than their numerical preponderance?

The author presents and develops the theological positions taken in the Epistle more fully and with more manifest interest than the critical and historical problems involved. He reveals in these discussions a conservative temper, but, at the same time, a free and open mind. The limits of this review forbid anything beyond a brief statement of his views upon some of these subjects. The examples given below of his interpretation of important terms or sections in the Epistle will sufficiently illustrate his point of view and the results in general of his exegesis.

He holds, for example, that in 1 3, 4 we have a summary of the Pauline gospel. The conception of the Son of God is plainly from the Old Testament, and the thought of the apostle is occupied with the fulfilment of prophecy in the historical facts of Jesus' life. If the doctrine of the pre-existence of the Son of God lies in the background, it does not find expression in these verses. Paul's conception of the divinity of Christ rests rather upon the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus to a position of divine dignity, through which he became Son of God "in the full sense of the term." So in 9 5 the Christ is from the Jews according to the flesh, but, as exalted at the right hand of God, Paul addresses him, in his inserted doxology, as One who is "God over all, blessed forever"; for Kühn is confident that these words are addressed to Christ and not to the Father.

In his interpretation of 1 4 the Professor holds that in Christ the place of the *νοῦς* in the unregenerate man, is, in Paul's view, occupied by the *πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης* in Jesus Christ. As he maintains that

the same Spirit which pervaded and controlled Jesus is also bestowed upon men who are born again, it does not seem probable that he means to deny to Jesus the possession of *νοῦς*, but only to affirm that, through all his life, it was pervaded and controlled by the Spirit of holiness.

Professor Kühn affirms that the thought expressed somewhat incidentally in 1 17 controls the discussion through the long section which follows as far as 5 10, and that its influence is felt in the sections which follow that. The righteousness of God is the equivalent of the divine forgiveness bestowed upon the *ἀσεβῆς* before repentance, and does not, in itself, involve a moral change; any change or improvement in character is due to the subsequent gift of the Holy Spirit. He contends against Jülicher's views that in justification God enables men by faith to appropriate His own righteousness, and holds that Jülicher is in the wrong when he affirms that Paul would never have been satisfied with the simple reckoning of something which, in truth, did not exist. Justification anticipates and prepares for conversion as well as sanctification. It is essentially negative, the removal of a hindrance to an upright and spiritual life. At the same time, the only salvation offered to men is through this righteousness of God accepted by faith. For all who do not attain this the final judgment must be judged upon their works, and this judgment must be condemnatory of all without exception. The cases suggested in 2 26, 27 are purely hypothetical.

The author is perhaps most original in his full and vigorous discussion of Paul's theodicy, presented in the long section of the Epistle from chapter ninth through the eleventh chapter. He interprets Paul's argument here as involving not only the doctrine that the repentance and salvation of both Jews and Gentiles is dependent upon the divine decree and control, and that, in the execution of His purposes, God makes use of the sin and obduracy of men, but also that all their sins and hardness of heart, illustrated in the attitude of the large majority of Paul's Jewish contemporaries, are due to the will and positive control of God. Even the tenth chapter does not really, but only apparently, qualify this view. This interpretation is not novel; it appears as early as the time of Calvin, perhaps of Augustine. But Kühn holds that Paul is discussing, not a general and eternal principle of the divine government, but rather a problem of his own generation. The fate of past generations is not in the apostle's mind, nor does he forecast the religious character of future generations, for, in his view, the end of the world is near at hand, and the promise of God must be fulfilled before the great catastrophe

occurs. The substitution, in the proclamation of Christianity, of the law of faith for the law of works had, necessarily and by divine appointment, stumbled and hardened consistent Jews who revered the law of God as given in their Scriptures. But the hardening of the Jews opened the way for the proclamation of the Gospel to the Gentiles; which they could the more readily accept, and thus be grafted into the true olive tree. But their engrafting would kindle the jealousy of the Jews and arouse them to seek re-engrafting, and thus all Israel would be saved; not simply a considerable number of Israelites who may be considered the ideal Israel, as Zahn mistakenly interprets, but all Israel, though Kühn does not affirm that this includes every soul in the Israel of Paul's generation.

Dr. Kühn ably defends this thesis. It is not the province of a reviewer to examine in detail his exegesis. But a reader of the commentary cannot avoid raising the question—which it may not be the duty of an exegete to raise or answer—Just where does this interpretation of the apostle's view leave the apostle? Could he, as a man of insight and clear vision, thirty years or so after the crucifixion of Jesus, after all his experience with non-Christian Jews and Jewish Christians, have supposed that within the period of that generation in which he lived, all Israel would renounce its belief in the saving power of obedience to God's law and accept the doctrine of salvation by simple faith in Jesus, under the motive of jealousy kindled by the conversion of Gentiles—however the word "jealousy" may be defined? It seems impossible; and one cannot escape the conviction that the interpretation of a writer must be influenced, if not controlled, by the evidence of the writer's general sanity and power to interpret the facts of life. That a very intelligent man may believe in the speedy coming of the Lord and the end of the age, is easily admitted. Such a belief does not rest upon or reckon with the forces and tendencies which are observed in the social, moral, and religious conditions of one's contemporaries. But that Paul could have believed, about the year 58 A.D., that the Jews were just on the threshold of a sudden and substantially universal acceptance of Christianity, seems incredible. Nor is this much relieved by any reasonable theory of Paul's belief of the power of God and the principle of determinism upon which God is supposed to control the wills and characters of men. For, in Paul's view, God is a god of order, and His control of human life, however absolute it may be, is not arbitrary or lawless. If Paul had believed that all Israel was, in his generation, to pass through an experience like his own on the Damascus road, would he not have depicted this

conviction clearly, with a rhetorical fervor and a pictorial imagination, rather than in a plain and not very correct figure taken from horticulture; and would he not have found a loftier and more inspiring word than "jealousy" to express the motive under which they were to act? It does not seem impossible that Paul may have believed in a speedy coming of the Lord and yet of a continued progress of Christianity after that great event, which would result in the ultimate conversion of all Israel.

There are some general features of the book which merit brief mention in closing this review.

As has already been remarked, the commentary aims to expound the religious convictions of the apostle as expressed in the Epistle, rather than to examine and interpret the terms in which these views are expressed. The literary and religious history of significant terms is here not often discussed with much fullness, and but limited use is made, and then usually by reference to Deissmann's labors, of the recently published Greek papyri.

Dr. Kühl does not believe that the doctrines or rites of the mystery cults had any real influence in Paul's development of Christian doctrine, or his interpretation of the sacraments; though terms thus made familiar to his readers, and certain ideas connected with them may have aided in the expression and transmission of his own views, which were suggested by the Old Testament as interpreted and enforced by his own Christian experience.

Earlier commentaries, even down to those of the last generation, are but sparingly cited, while a limited number of contemporaneous writers are frequently referred to and quoted with approval or disapproval. This feature may add to the value of the commentary for the readers for whom it was especially designed; but for an American reader, the book is, in too large degree, a commentary upon the writings of Zahn, Jülicher, Lietzmann, and a few others, rather than upon the writing of the Apostle Paul.

The text of the Epistle is not printed either in Greek or German, but in its place the author gives a rather full paraphrase of its contents, in sections scattered through the book, thus occupying about eighty of the five hundred pages.

WILLIAM H. RYDER.